

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/589,514	06/08/2000	Allan Herrod	4842.0068-01	1287
7590 12/30/2004		EXAMINER		
ALAN ISRAEL, ESQ			FRANKLIN, JAMARA ALZAIDA	
Kirschstein, Ot 489 Fifth Aven	tinger, Israel & Schiffn ue	niller, P.C.	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
New YorK, NY 10017-6105			2876	

DATE MAILED: 12/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	09/589,514	HERROD ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Jamara A. Franklin	2876					
The MAILING DATE of this communication apperiod for Reply	opears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence add	ress				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailinearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a repl ply within the statutory minimum of thirty (3 d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH tte, cause the application to become ABAN	y be timely filed 30) days will be considered timely. S from the mailing date of this com DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nmunication.				
Status			-				
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22	November 2004.						
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	is action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>76-79</u> is/are pending in the applicati	on.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	•						
6)⊠ Claim(s) 76-79 is/are rejected.	· · · ——						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin	ner						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		19(a)-(d) or (f).					
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
_	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri		ceived in this National S	tage				
application from the International Bures		a a to a al					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	it of the certified copies not re	ceived.					
Attachment(s)							
1) Motice of References Cited (PTO-892)		nmary (PTO-413)					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	_	fail Date mal Patent Application (PTO-1	152)				
 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/04</u>. 	6) Other:	mai - atent Application (P10-	102)				

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/22/04 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 3. Claim 76 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mueller et al. (US 6,185,413) (hereinafter referred to as 'Mueller').

Mueller teaches a method of reducing a cost of transmitting data from a mobile data collection terminal to a remote host over a communication network having a plurality of channels including a wireless channel, comprising the steps of:

determining a location of the terminal (mobile station 1) relative to the host (destination set) (col. 7, lines 22-33);

Application/Control Number: 09/589,514 Page 3

Art Unit: 2876

determining the cost of transmitting the data from the location of the terminal over each channel (mobile radio network or service provider) to the host (col. 7, line 64-col. 8, line 4);

selecting the channel for data transmission based on the location of the terminal and the cost determined to be least (col. 8, lines 26-31); and

transmitting the data from the terminal to the host over the channel selected with the least cost.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claim 77 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mueller in view of Pieterse (US 6,088,127).

The teachings of Mueller have been discussed above.

Mueller lacks the teaching of the step of determining a priority for the data.

Pieterse teaches the step of determining a priority of data wherein the selecting step is also based on the priority data (col. 8, lines 35-48).

One of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized that transmitting data in view of priority of the data would have been beneficial to the invention of Mueller for the purpose of arranging data so that time and energy may be conserved in trying to transmit less

important data. Therefore, it would have been obvious, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Mueller with the aforementioned step as taught by Pieterse.

6. Claims 78 and 79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mueller in view of Wang et al. (US 5,490,217) (hereinafter referred to as 'Wang').

The teachings of Mueller have been discussed above.

Mueller lacks the teaching of recording an image using an image capture device, and wherein the transmitting step includes transmitting the image.

Wang teaches transmitting a bar code (col. 4, lines 3-12).

One of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized that an image, particularly a bar code image, is one of a plethora of data which may be transmitted to a remote location for the purpose of conveying information to another source. Therefore, it would have been obvious, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Mueller with the transmission of an image as taught by Wang convey information.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments, filed 11/22/04, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 76-79 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of the Mueller, Pieterse, and Wang inventions as discussed above.

Art Unit: 2876

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jamara A. Franklin whose telephone number is (571) 272-2389. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00am to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee can be reached on (571) 272-2398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Examiner
Art Unit 2876

JAF December 22, 2004

MICHAEL G. LEE SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800